

City of Taylorsville
Planning Commission Meeting
Minutes
Tuesday – June 13, 2006 – 6:00 P.M.
2600 West Taylorsville Blvd – Council Chambers

Attendance:

Planning Commission

Kristie Overson, Chair
Ted Jensen, Chair
Angelo Calacino
Scott Bolton
Blaine Smith
Dama Barbour
Robert Daniels
Joan Rushton-Carlson (Alternate)

Community Development Staff

Mark McGrath, Director
Michael Maloy, City Planner
Dan Udall, City Planner
Nick Norris, City Planner
Jean Gallegos, Admin Asst/Recorder

PUBLIC: Anna Williams, Cindy Turnquist, Doug Turnquist, Philip Holland, Steven W. Dougherty, Jill Owens, Bob Bedont, Florence Bedont, Patti Walker, M.C. Burkhardt, Joan Schuller, Sean Hansen, Ed Parry, Morris K. Pratt

19:02:36

WELCOME: **Commissioner Overson** opened the meeting at 7:00 p.m., explained the procedures to be followed this evening. Agenda Item #11 has been pulled by the applicant.

CONSENT AGENDA

Agenda/File Nr.	Name/Address/Type Application	P.C. Action
1. Minutes for April 11, 2006		Approved as presented.
2. 16H06 Home Occ	<u>Marcus Cordero</u> – 4890 S. Forest Circle Home Occupation – Business Consulting Office	Approved as presented by Staff – adding hours of operation to read 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
3. 21H06 Home Occ	<u>Jill Owen</u> – 6335 South Dusty Circle (3950 West) Art and Candle Sales	Approved as presented by Staff – adding hours of operation to read 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.
4. 17C06 CUP	<u>Robert Larsen</u> – 3457 W. 4700 S. Monument Sign	Approved as presented by Staff.
5. 20C06 CUP	<u>Cindy Turnquist</u> – 1194 W. 4800 S. Oversized Detached Garage (Preliminary)	Approved as presented by Staff.
6. 11S06 Subdivision	<u>David Hara (Carriage Square)</u> – 4120 S. 1785 W. Subdivision Amendment (Preliminary)	Approved as presented by Staff.

No one spoke.

MOTION: **Commissioner Daniels - 19:05:11** I move for approval of Consent Agenda Items 1 through 6.

SECOND: **Commissioner Calacino.**

DISCUSSION: **Commissioner Barbour** - Madam Chair, I do think we need to make a note of the hours of operation. **Commissioner Overson - 19:06:59** I think that is in Item #2, File 16H06 and Item #3, File 21H06. The hours of operation should read 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Commissioner Daniels - I would be pleased to add that to my motion.

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor.

HOME OCCUPATIONS

- | | |
|---|---|
| 7. 18H06
Equipment Home Occupation. (Nick Norris/City Planner) | <u>Steve Howard, 5161 S. 1130 W.</u> – Maintenance and Repair of Carpet Stripper |
|---|---|

[19:07:24](#)

7.1 **Mr. Norris** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting a Class B Home Occupation Conditional Use Permit to repair and perform maintenance on carpet stripping equipment. No customers would be coming to the home. According to the applicant, in most cases, he would be repairing the equipment at other locations, however, would probably be bringing two or three machines per month home to be repaired. The applicant also stated that two to three carpet strippers per month would be shipped to his residence to be repaired. These would mainly come from out of state. Proposed hours of operation would be 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Garage would be used primarily for this home occupation.

7.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** A representative for Mr. Howard was present.

7.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

7.3 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION DISCUSSION OR A MOTION:**

7.4 **MOTION:** [19:10:11 Commissioner Rushton-Carlson - I recommend approval of Application 18H06 based on findings of fact and in accordance with Staff's recommendations.](#)
SECOND: [Commissioner Barbour](#)
VOTE: [All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.](#)

8. 19H06 Anna Williams – 3515 W. 5660 S. – Making and Selling Silver Items and Jewelry Home Occupation. (Dan Udall/City Planner)

[19:11:31](#)

8.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. Applicant has amended her request from 15 clients per day down to 6 clients. **Mr. Udall** added that stipulation to his Staff recommendations. **Staff recommends approval subject to the following conditions:**

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. The home occupation is subject to review upon complaint.
3. The only signage allowed is a three square foot sign attached to the single-family home.
4. That adequate parking be provided on site to accommodate the homeowner's vehicles and customer vehicles coming to the home.
5. **[Changed by Motion]** That customers can come to the home only between the hours of 7:00 ~~p.m.~~ **a.m.** to 8:00 p.m.
6. That the home occupation is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling for dwelling purposes and does not change the character of the dwelling or property for residential purposes.
7. That the business is conducted on an appointment only basis.
8. **[Added Condition]** That only up to six clients will be allowed each day.

8.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Ms. Williams** was present and asked that the hours of operation be amended to reflect 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. instead of 7:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. **Commissioner Overson** advised that would be reflected in the motion.

8.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

8.4 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:**

8.5 **MOTION:** [19:14:40 Commissioner Calacino - Based on findings of fact and testimony heard this evening, along with Staff's recommendations, adding one to limit the number of clients per day to six and clarifying the hours of operation in #5, I move for approval of Application 19H06.](#)
SECOND: [Commissioner Daniels 19:15:54](#)
VOTE: [All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.](#)

9. 20H06 Edward Parry – 5905 S. 3230 W. – Making and Selling Specialty Wood Molding Home Occupation. (Dan Udall/City Planner)
--

[19:16:13](#)

9.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. The applicant is requesting to make and sell wood molding. A total of two to three clients will be coming to the home each day. The applicant has a two-car

driveway on the site. The hours of operation are proposed to be 10:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., two days a week. The days of the week will vary. Staff is a little concerned about the noise and ventilation perceived.

Staff recommends denial unless applicant can justify the use.

If the Planning Commission approved the Conditional Use Permit, Staff recommends the following conditions:

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. **[Changed by Motion]** The home occupation is subject to review upon **substantiated and unresolved** complaint.
3. That the only signage allowed is a three square foot sign attached to the single-family home.
4. Adequate parking must be provided on site to accommodate the homeowner's vehicles and customer vehicles coming to the home.
5. **[Changed by Motion]** That customers can come to the home only between the hours of 7:00 p.m. to ~~8:00~~ **5:00** p.m.
6. That the home occupation is clearly incidental and secondary to the use of the dwelling for dwelling purposes and does not change the character of the dwelling or property for residential purposes.
7. That no outside storage is allowed.
8. That storage of stock in trade inventory or commodities shall not occupy more than 500 cubic feet of the area being used for the home occupation and shall not be visible outside the dwelling unit.
9. That alterations shall not be made to the dwelling or the yard area that will change its residential character.

9.2 **APPLICANT WAS PRESENT: Edward Parry. 19:19:20 Commissioner Calacino** asked what type of equipment would be used and **Commissioner Smith** wanted to know if a dust collector system would be installed. **Mr. Parry** advised that he would be using a table saw, shaper and joiner and would install a dust collector. With regard to the noise, he advised that he would only be doing this a couple of days a week and for only a couple of hours at a time. He had talked with the neighbors and none expressed a problem with what he intended to do. **Commissioner Smith** wanted to know if there would be glue involved and **Mr. Parry** said no glue would be used on this product because it is solid wood. **Commissioner Barbour** asked about the noise level of the dust collector and **Mr. Parry** likened it to that made by the average household vacuum. **Commissioner Daniels** wanted to know if there was an adjustable decibel rating on the unit and **Mr. Parry** said he did not know but would check on that. **Commissioner Calacino** asked how much stock in trade would be kept within the garage and Mr. Parry said it would be minimal, not exceeding 500 board foot of wood at any one time. **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** inquired about the type of delivery service he would provide and **Mr. Parry** said it would just be his own pick-up truck, nothing larger.

9.2 **SPEAKING:** None.

9.3 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:**

9.4 **MOTION: Commissioner Calacino 19:29:10** In light of testimony by the Applicant to answer questions posed by the Commission, I think there is justification to move forward in approving this application and also would comment that the applicant is not quite aware of what the decibel rating might be for the dust collector and is going to find out what that is before he purchases the unit. If he chooses not to venture into this business, that will be his decision. I would go on record in making a recommendation to approve the application based on oral testimony, findings of fact in the Staff Report, and the fact that the Applicant has tried to make the Commissioners aware of how is going to operate only two or three times a week, with very limited hours. Based on that I would suggest that we limit the days of operation and the hours, however, we always have the fail safe of review upon complaint. If it does start growing, the neighbors and he will know that and make the necessary changes. With that I make the recommendation for approval with the nine conditions outlined by Staff, correcting #5 hours of operation to actually be 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and maybe just Monday through Saturday for days of operation. **19:30:19.**
SECOND: Commissioner Barbour
DISCUSSION: Commissioner Daniels asked if it would be possible to amend Staff Recommendation #2 to add the words "substantiated or unresolved", to which **Commissioner Calacino** agreed. **Commissioner Barbour** wanted the Applicant asked if restricting his closing time to 5:00 p.m. would create a problem and he said it would not and said he actually would not be starting as early as 8:00 a.m. either. He also asked at this point, to whom would he turn the information regarding the decibel rating and was informed that it would be to Mr. Udall on Staff.
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

ZONING AMENDMENT

10. 1Z06 **Gold Medallion, 6150 South Redwood Road** – Recommendation to the City Council to Amend the zoning Map from A-1 and R-M to MD-3. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

[19:34:22](#)

10.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. Gold Medallion Homes has requested this zoning map amendment for approximately 1.82 acres of property located at 6110 S., 6122 S., and 6150 S. Redwood Road. The request is to amend the existing zoning classification from A-1 Agricultural and R-M Residential to MD-3 Mixed Development. The purpose is to facilitate development of two professional office buildings within two phases. The first phase will contain a two-story office building with walk-out basement, which will be occupied by the offices of Gold Medallion Homes. Following a public hearing on the matter, the Planning Commission voted 5-0 to continue the amendment application and directed the applicant to “work through issues” that had been identified by the Commission and Staff during the public hearing process. Essentially, these issues were as follows: Property assemblage; transportation and public safety; total dwelling units, and project design. Currently the property has more than one zoning on it and the developer wants to strengthen this corridor by adding office professional. **Staff recommends approval based on the following findings of fact:**

1. Zoning Map Amendment is consistent with the existing Taylorsville General Plan Map.
2. Proposed land use is consistent with proposed General Plan Update.
3. Conceptual site plan demonstrates feasibility of successful compliance with City development regulations including access from Redwood Road and potential cross-access easement for adjacent properties.

10.2 **DISCUSSION:** [19:36:20](#) **Mr. Maloy** said that Staff is questioning why the applicant is asking for the intensity provided with MD-3 zoning. **Commissioner Daniels** wanted to know if the potential requirement for cross access easement had been discussed and was advised by **Mr. Maloy** that the applicant expressed willingness to do so. **Commissioner Calacino** said that the updated General Plan shows office professional. [19:44:53](#) **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** suggested approving the MD-3 zoning and adding the restriction that approval is based on the site plan as submitted. **Mr. Maloy** reminded the Commissioners that they have the ability to add zoning conditions within four areas (use conditions, dwelling intensity, building square footage and height of structures).

10.3 **APPLICANT:** **Philip Holland, Gold Medallion Homes.** [19:48:34](#) **Mr. Holland** said that their office building would reflect their personal vision and the perception reflects what the clients would anticipate getting in a home built for them by Gold Medallion Homes, therefore, it is very important that this be of the highest quality. **Mr. Holland** said that his company is open to having this parcel designated Office Professional but that the MD-3 zoning was established during their first proposal for the site. He advised that they would do a traffic study within the upcoming week to determine the best egress point. **Commissioner Jensen** commented that the entrance is already existing and **Mr. Holland** said that was true but that they had to start over and building new road cuts. **Commissioner Jensen** asked if the Church had expressed any desire for expansion and **Mr. Holland** said that they had and something may come of that in the future.

10.3 **SPEAKING:**

- **Bob Bedont.** (Lives immediately south of this project). [19:57:18](#) **Mr. Bedont** said that this appears to be a good project, however, that he was disappointed that he had not been contacted until one day before this meeting. He felt that showed a lack of good faith in wanting to offer any element of protection for Mr. Bedont's property. He felt that the property around this site has the potential to develop commercially and with Gold Medallion developing this parcel now, it greatly restricts the property value and develop-ability of Mr. Bedont's property. [19:59:23](#) **Mr. Bedont** expressed that they want something more than just another development and would request decorative block walls, with trees, lighting directed away and hours of operation consistent with residential living. The irrigation ditch must be consistently maintained and water rights are paramount. He felt his requests were fair and reasonable and would have preferred a coordinated development involving all the properties along there. The traffic problem in that area of Redwood Road is terrible. He is not so much opposed to the proposal as he is disappointed that he was not talked with about it. **Commissioner Daniels** asked Mr. Bedont if he had ever called Gold Medallion Homes to discuss it and was informed that they were to supposed to call him, not the other way around. **Commissioner Barbour** asked Mr. Bedont to be sure and come back with the site plan is reviewed by the Commission. **Mr. Bedont** expressed frustration that his use is less important than this developer.

10.4 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:** **Commissioner Rushton-Carlson** said that if she understood Mr. Bedont correctly, he is the only resident on Redwood Road in this area and was informed that was correct. **20:09:27 Commissioner Calacino** said that tonight the Commission is only looking at a zone change. The site plan review is still upcoming. **Commissioner Barbour** commented that it would be wonderful if there were ten acres which could be developed, but there just isn't and the Commission can only work with what is presented. **Mr. Maloy** advised that the Economic Development Director for the City, Don Adams, agreed that more land would have been easier to work with, however, that the conceptual plan submitted by Gold Medallion Homes was exactly what his department was looking for there. **20:14:33 Commissioner Barbour** was concerned with Mr. Bedont's comment that this would devalue his property and wanted to know if that were true. **Mr. Maloy** said that most Redevelopment projects actually raise property values due to improvements established. **Commissioner Barbour** said that she did not feel this zoning change would hurt Mr. Bedont but did want him to actively stay involved with this proposal's stages.

- 10.5 **MOTION: 20:20:02 Commissioner Calacino - Based on the Staff Report, comments heard this evening and findings of fact, I would move for a positive recommendation to the City Council to change this property to MD-3, which keeps with the current General Plan. This developer can do an office under that zoning but other developers could do mixed use. I am not comfortable with rezoning to Office Professional and would prefer MD-3.**
SECOND: Commissioner Daniels
DISCUSSION: Commissioner Daniels recommended that the developer reads Mr. Bedont's comments that he furnished to the Planning Commission.
VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

CONDITIONAL USES

- | |
|--|
| 11. 18C06 <u>PacifiCorp, 5292 South 2700 West</u> - Remove Slats from West Gates at Utah Power and Light Substation. (Dan Udall/City Planner) |
|--|

Withdrawn by applicant via E-Mail to Mr. Udall on June 9, 2006.

- | |
|--|
| 12. 19C06 <u>Sean Hansen, 6392 S. 2200 W.</u> – Conditional Use Permit to Operate a Wholesale Nursery. (Michael Maloy/City Planner) |
|--|

20:22:50

12.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. (Mr. Maloy combined his presentation for #12 and #14, same parcel). Mr. Sean Hansen (applicant) is the owner/operator of a landscape business known as sonic Solutions. He submitted a conditional use permit to operate a wholesale nursery on this parcel. The proposed land use would only occupy a portion of an existing 1.37 acre residential parcel. The current property owner, Mr. Michael Dutson, has submitted an application to the city to subdivide the parcel into two lots: The "front" lot will measure .37 of an acre and will contain the existing dwelling unit, while the "rear" or "deep" lot will contain one acre for use by the applicant to operate the proposed wholesale nursery. He advised that he had received calls in opposition to the subdivision, however, they seemed to deal more with access and utilities issues than the subdivision itself. **Staff recommends preliminary approval of the CUP and the subsequent subdivision with the following conditions:**

1. Conditional Use Permit, File 19C06:
 - Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies and departments of the City of Taylorsville (i.e., City Engineer, Unified Fire Authority, Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District, etc.)
 - Final conditional use permit approval is subject to successful subdivision of subject property compliant with City and County regulations.
 - Planning Stall shall review final conditional use permit application.
 - Site plan shall provide one accessible parking stall, which is van accessible, with a loading area on the passenger side of the vehicle compliant with ANSI standards.
 - Applicant shall submit for final approval a site lighting plan with product specifications that will control light pollution from impacting adjacent residential properties.
 - Applicant shall submit a fence plan (i.e., location, height, type) that is compliant with direction from the Planning Commission given during preliminary review.

- Applicant shall identify the location of a trash dumpster and enclosure on final site plan. Enclosure shall be constructed of durable materials compatible with proposed land use with an opaque swinging gate.
- Applicant shall limit hours of operation (to be determined by Planning Commission following public hearing).

12.2 **DISCUSSION:** 20:29:38 Commissioner Barbour wanted to know if the Dutsons planned to remain in the home after the parcel is subdivided and Mr. Maloy advised that was correct. Commissioner Overson asked if municipal services can be provided without a problem and Mr. Maloy advised that was correct, adding that they would need a larger waste receptacle than a normal residence. Commissioner Barbour suggested that the issue of the subdivision be dealt with ahead of the conditional use permit. 20:31:46 Commissioner Overson felt that could be achieved by adding a condition that the Conditional Use Permit is subject to approval of the subdivision. 20:32:27

12.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** Sean Hansen. Mr. Hansen indicated that Mr. Maloy had explained the proposal well and would answer questions from the Commission. Commissioner Rushton-Carlson asked if Mr. Hansen was the owner of the property and he replied he was not currently and added that his plans were to use this property as a base for a landscape business. 20:34:26 Commissioner Calacino asked him to speak to the issue of this being a wholesale business or rather a base for a landscape business. 20:34:55 Mr. Hansen said they were going to grow plants, shrubs and trees for their landscape business. The trees presently located on the site are the ideal age to harvest and plant using their landscape business. The plan was to utilize this site only for the landscape business at first and if it does well, branch out into the wholesale nursery business. Mr. Maloy advised that Staff and the Applicant have discussed the future business model, however, for now the applicants plan to just relocate their center of operation to Taylorsville. Mr. Hansen said that in the future there is the possibility of relocating their entire business to this site. 20:38:20 Commissioner Calacino's concern was that it would be more than a nursery business and would in fact be a contractor site with sheds, equipment, vehicles, etc., which increases the commercial activity in the area. 20:41:00 Commissioner Barbour said that the trees pretty much fill the whole back acre. Mr. Hansen advised that was correct and would be initial stock. Commissioner Rushton-Carlson wanted to know if a green house would be erected on the site after the trees had all been harvested and Mr. Hansen said they have no plans to build any structures on the site. 20:43:10 Commissioner Overson expressed concern that what is being said this evening does not mesh with what the application says and it may be appropriate to have a continuance. She was very concerned about the parking issues and that employees would be coming and going in there everyday. Mr. Maloy said that the actual land use excludes retail sales and agreed that if this use grows beyond what has been projected there may be a need to protect the adjacent property owners.

12.4 **SPEAKING:**

- **Steve Quinn** (Real Estate Agent). 20:50:15. Mr. Quinn said there seems to be some confusion here and that Mr. Hansen would be willing to bring his license to this site but has other properties and could just use this locale for the tree harvest to utilize in his landscaping business. The storage of some equipment is valid. His current location does not have a building and he could store his plowing equipment here during the summer months. Commissioner Overson expressed concern over people going in and out more than occasionally for this use. Mr. Quinn said that zoning for this site allows for "nursery" and Mr. Hansen only intends to operate a wholesale nursery.
- **Chad Miller** (Resident nearby). 20:55:11. His backyard faces the tree orchard and he was concerned about what is going to happen to the birds that presently live in that forest. He also wanted to know what type of equipment would be used in harvesting the trees.
- **Mike Dutson** (Present property owner). 20:55:41 He has owned this piece of property for 30 years and previously has tried to do something with that back piece of property and felt this use would be perfect for this property. There will not be a lot of equipment back there and it won't bother anyone. Mr. Dutson would be living in the home on the same site and did not feel it would bother him. 20:57:17

12.5 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:** Commissioner Overson asked Mr. Hansen to address Mr. Miller's question on the type of equipment to be involved. Mr. Hansen said that initially, the first couple of days, they would probably be in and out of there a lot but after that only on an as needed basis. He plans to leave a barrier of trees along the perimeter fences, which will improve the appearance of both properties. The types of equipment would be a small bobcat that reaches into the ground and lifts up the tree and wraps it in burlap. Commissioner Jensen 21:00:27 felt some things needed restating: Under the Agricultural Zone under permitted uses, it says permitted uses in the A-1 Zone include accessory uses and buildings customarily incidental to

permitted uses. Under Conditional Uses it has nursery and/or green house, excluding retail sales. Therefore, he felt that a nursery is an agricultural use and fits well. Also allowed are only accessory uses and buildings customarily incidental to permitted uses, so putting the bobcat in the building and tree equipment in the building to maintain the property is acceptable. The exclusion of retail sales assures that there will be no customers coming there. That clearly defines the intended use. However, the storage of winter equipment does not fit that definition.

Commissioner Calacino said that in regards to the subdivision there are no issues or concerns. It sounded as if the utilities could be brought in from 2200 West and do not have to intrude on the properties to the south and the lot would be in compliance with established standards. As for the conditional use, he was hesitant and needed clarification on issues. Whether it is a contracting business or a wholesale nursery with harvesting the stock and storing equipment for that, improvements still need to be made to the land to accommodate that use, such as the right of way needs to be paved and some parking needs to be provided. No parking is allowed in the turn around area. Some additional buffering needs to be included, especially along the south property line. There needs to be clarification on exactly how the trash will be dealt with. There needs to be more work done on the conditional use permit and he would not feel comfortable approving that and leaned towards continuing the application to resolve those issues. **Commissioner Barbour** said she believed the trees are the best buffering possible for the neighbors and wanted to make sure at least some of them stay in place. She agreed that there still needs to be more work done before the conditional use can be approved. **Commissioner Overson** added that she agreed with that as well. She was not opposed to this use but the Commission needs to be sure that everyone understands what will happen on this piece of property.

12.6 **MOTION: Commissioner Rushton-Carlson - I recommend approval of File 20S06, simple subdivision, based on recommendations and testimony heard this evening and including Staff Recommendations. It is a good plan for the City and applicant as well.**

SECOND: Commissioner Calacino

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

12.7 **MOTION: Commissioner Daniels - 21:09:48 I move that Item 19C06 be continued to allow applicant to be more specific in his application for conditional use permit. Mr. Maloy - That could happen within two weeks, depending upon the applicant's response. Commissioner Daniels - A recommendation for a two week continuance is included in my motion. That date specific is June 27, 2006.**

SECOND: Commissioner Calacino.

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

13. 37C05 **Ronald Daw (Prolifica LLC)** – 1280 W. Winchester Street and 6657 S. 1300 W. – Final Approval of a CUP to construct a single-family attached residential PUD within an R-M Residential Zone. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

21:12:17

13.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. (Mr. Maloy combined his presentation for #13 and #15, same parcel). On September 13, 2005, the Planning Commission granted preliminary approval of the proposed townhouse development with 27 conditions. Following preliminary approval, the applicant successfully petitioned the City twice to amend the original conditions of approval, which added four additional conditions of preliminary approval. During the past several months, the applicant has worked with Staff in order to respond to each of the 31 conditions.

13.2 **APPLICANT: Jim Allred** represented Prolifica LLC. **Mr. Allred** advised that they have tried to comply with Staff recommendations and are compliant with most of them. The homes that were existing have now been demolished. **Commissioner Overson** was concerned that there were no windows in the garage doors and **Mr. Allred** advised that would be included but they wanted to use local vendors. **Commissioner Barbour** asked about the Home Owner's Association and **Mr. Allred** said that it would be joint with the Signature Development. **Mr. Maloy** added comments that Staff would prefer that the retaining wall be constructed out of rock instead of solid concrete. That issue was left out of the Staff recommendations and he wanted it included now. 21:17:52

13.3 Following is a list of conditions of preliminary approval, which was provided in order to assist the Planning Commission evaluate the level of compliance by the applicant: staff has listed below each condition as amended by the Commission, and has marked each condition with the following "assessment" icon.

Assessment Key

☺ **Compliant**

☹ **Partial compliance** – may need further discussion

☹ **Not compliant** – warrants further discussion

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies and departments of the City of Taylorsville (i.e. City Engineer, Uniform Fire Authority, Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District, etc.). ☺ **Compliant**
2. Planning Commission shall review final conditional use permit application for planned unit development (PUD) to ensure compliance with all applicable zoning codes unless otherwise permitted by the PUD ordinance. ☺ **Compliant**
3. Applicant must combine existing lots into one parcel, compliant with City and County regulations. ☺ **Compliant**
4. Applicant is to calculate total net acreage of development after dedication of required public right-of-way along 1300 West and Winchester Street to verify compliance of requested development density with the attached zoning condition, which limits residential development to 11 units per acre maximum. ☺ **Compliant** – *Gross acreage = 2.33 acres. Net acreage after dedication = 1.86 acres. Thus 1.86 acres X 11 dwelling units/acre = 20.46 dwelling units.*
5. Applicant is to provide a comparison between the proposed planned unit development with the dwelling group regulations contained within the R-M Zone (i.e. open space, parking, minimum landscaping, etc). ☺ **Compliant**
6. Applicant to provide a traffic engineering study to address the following:
 - City bicycle trail along 1300 West;
 - Sight distance at point of access on Winchester Street;
 - Storage analysis on both points of access (Winchester and 1300 W) and at adjacent signalized intersection;
 - Visitor parking within project. ☺ **Compliant**
7. For “Technical Review” provide a soils report with information on slope stability, ground water, liquefaction, and recommendations regarding retaining walls (if any). ☹ **Not compliant** – *However, it is not uncommon to provide this type of report to the City immediately prior to the City Engineer’s signature of approval on the actual subdivision mylar. Applicant is aware of the requirement and will submit two copies of the report to the City.*
8. Applicant shall provide an open space plan that creates positive, usable open space, and shall contain amenities compliant with staff comments contained within the staff report or as otherwise directed by the Planning Commission. Open space plan shall be reviewed by the Planning Commission for final approval. ☺ **Compliant**
9. Applicant shall coordinate with City staff a plan for all public and private improvements including streets, walkways and bicycle trails. Infrastructure improvement plan shall address off-site improvements if required by the City Engineer. Planning Commission shall review plan for final approval. (Note: City Engineer has suggested a meandering Type I bike trail along Winchester Street be included in site plan.) ☺ **Compliant** – *City Engineer opted to not require a meandering Type I bike trail along Winchester Street.*
10. Applicant should propose an internal trail component to be reviewed by the Planning Commission. ☹ **Partial compliance** – *As you know, the location and function of the internal trail system has been amended from the preliminary site plan, which amendment was approved by the Commission as part of its final approval of the adjoining development by Signature Development. However, this new alignment does not appear on the attached landscape plan or within the subdivision engineering plans.*
11. Applicant shall provide an accurate, uniform street tree planting plan. Street trees should be planted 25 feet on center within all public park strips and along private roadways. Trees may be adjusted for water meters and driveways. Street trees should also account for location of street lights and fire hydrants. ☺ **Compliant**
12. Provide site lighting plan and with product specifications. Street light pattern should be equally staggered on both sides of the roadway and not linearly aligned on one side only. Concrete bases for street light poles should be minimally exposed. ☺ **Compliant**
13. Applicant shall submit for final approval a decorative sign plan compatible with site design and architecture. Sign plan should use a uniform design with Winchester Overlook. ☺ **Compliant** –

Prolifica has committed to installing the identical decorative street signage system approved for the adjacent development.

14. For final review, provide a landscape plan designed by a professional landscape architect (or other experienced professional acceptable to staff). Landscape plan shall contain construction details, species type, locations, quantities and plant sizes. Applicant is required to select a mixture of plants to create variety and "seasonal colors" within plant beds. As an important element of the required open space plan, landscape plan should represent an exceptional level in quality and address maintenance of open space. ☺ **Compliant**
15. Building setbacks. House portion should not be any closer than 10' to the back of curb; buildings should not be closer than 15' between structures on the sides and should not have a rear yard any less than 15'. Building setbacks along Winchester and 1300 West will be 19' from property line and not 15' as shown on the preliminary site plan. ☺ **Compliant**
16. Development is to incorporate a minimum driveway length of 18' when measured from back of curb to the front of the garage. ☺ **Compliant** – *A few driveway configurations may warrant further amendment to improve vehicular backing and public safety.*
17. Design a centrally located common area to provide a gathering place for the community. Designated common area should not be less than at least 1,000 square feet in area. ☺ **Compliant**
18. Development will not be permitted as a gated community. Private roadway shall not be less than 25' wide when measured from back of curb to back of curb. However, the Planning Commission recommends that the street be at least 30' wide (measured from back of curb to back of curb) and built to City standards, in case of a future request to dedicate the private road to the City. ☺ **Compliant**
19. Provide a perimeter fence or wall plan along the west and south property line. Design of wall or fence must be consistent with Winchester Overlook project. Wall placement along 1300 West and Winchester is to be setback five feet from the property line to provide an area for landscaping along the streetscape and is to be positioned so as to not interfere with the "clear view area" as required by the City Engineer. Provide location, height and fence material specifications to be used in development for final approval by the Planning Commission. ☺ **Compliant** – *Applicant has proposed installation of a solid pre-cast masonry fence along Winchester Street and 1300 West to match adjacent development.*
20. Submit plan for refuse collection (community dumpsters or individual garbage cans) for final site plan approval. ☺ **Compliant** – *Applicant has opted for individual garbage cans for each dwelling unit.*
21. Coordinate with Signature Development refinements in building elevations to ensure compatibility of each project while allowing for architectural variety, which can be an asset to the community if properly planned and designed. ☺ **Compliant**
22. All utilities shall be screened from primary views either by fences or densely planted vegetation. Roof located vent stacks are to be screened or carefully located to minimize negative impact. Rear or hidden locations are preferable to easily viewable locations from adjacent roadways. ☹ **Not compliant** – *Applicant is pursuing design of utility construction plans, which will include locations of all ground mounted utilities. Where needed, the applicant will amend the landscape plan accordingly.*
23. Except for decorative lighting such as a porch lights or garage lanterns, lighting should be downward cast or oriented toward building architecture. Lighting plans should not utilize simple utility or flood lights. ☹ **Not compliant** – *However, applicant will submit details of decorative lighting to staff for final approval.*
24. Applicant shall submit for final approval product specifications on architectural details such as exterior lighting including street lights, house numbers, mail boxes, and as otherwise directed by the Planning Commission. ☹ **Partial compliance** – *Although the applicant has submitted a number of architectural details for the project, the applicant has not submitted product specifications or construction drawings for the pergola to be installed within the common space. Also design for the mailbox kiosk does not appear to be compatible with other open space amenities (i.e. the pergola). Staff recommends an architectural design that is compatible with the proposed structures contained within the project.*

25. Preliminary material sample board should be refined for construction purposes prior to final approval; however applicant shall maintain cement-based fibrous board or other similar paintable lapped board as a primary fascia element. Stucco or similar products should be used sparingly (if any) due to construction problems and long-term maintenance. ☺ **Compliant**
26. Main entry should be a focal point of the front elevation. Exterior door and window details must be compatible with architectural design or vernacular. ☹ **Partial compliance** – *Main entry is somewhat overshadowed by projecting garage and front building elevation does not indicate windows within garage doors.*
27. Mitigate negative impacts caused by front loading garages by submitting for final approval specifications for an architectural grade garage door with windows (as shown). ☹ **Not compliant** – *However, applicant will submit detail of decorative garage door with windows to staff for final approval.*
28. Design of relocated private road from 1300 West shall comply with all engineering and zoning requirements of the City. ☺ **Compliant**
29. New “T” intersection must be terminated by an architectural and/or landscape element to maintain sense of enclosure and intimacy, which was a significant design element of the preliminary site plan proposed by the applicant and approved by the Planning Commission. Design solution subject to Planning Commission final approval. ☺ **Compliant** – *Applicant has proposed a monument sign surrounded by a landscaped bed with three evergreen trees planted behind the sign. Planning Commission reviewed this solution during the May 23, 2006 meeting and granted approval as part of the adjacent development.*
30. Alignment of proposed trail is not approved as shown on site plan amendment. ☹ **Partial compliance** – *See comments on condition number 10 above.*
31. Final conditional use permit application shall be subject to all other conditions of preliminary approval as required by the Planning Commission. (Amended December 13, 2005.) ☹ **Partial compliance** – *Based on staff review, applicant has:*
 - ☺ Fully complied with 22 of the above conditions;
 - ☹ Partially complied with 5 of the above conditions; and has
 - ☹ Not yet complied with 4 of the above conditions.

13.4 **Staff recommends final approval of Conditional Use Permit 37C05 with the following conditions:**

1. Applicant shall comply with all conditions of preliminary approval unless removed by the Planning Commission or otherwise modified by the following conditions of final approval.
2. Pedestrian pathway from Tripp Hill Lane to common space amenities should be aligned to physically connect with the common space rather than terminate at the east end of Overlook Place.
3. Applicant shall correct the following elements of the landscape: All deciduous trees should measure two inch caliper or more; evergreen trees should measure six feet tall or more; perennial/annual planting area species selection should be increased and spacing guidelines should be decreased; and shoulder landscape beds along project entryway on 1300 West should be coordinate with fencing plan.
4. Proposed fence plan shall comply with the clear view triangle required by City Code. Fence plan along entrance into the project is to be further refined and resubmitted for staff final approval.
5. Refine civil engineering plans to include placement and specifications of ground mounted utilities. Amend proposed landscape plan to reflect locations of ground mounted utilities and provide screening for said improvements.
6. Submit architectural and construction details for the pergola to be installed within common space. Refine design of mailbox kiosk to be compatible with other open space amenities (i.e., the pergola). Use of natural, weather resistant materials is strongly encouraged.
7. **[Added by Motion] That not only the CC&R's are to be jointly used by both developments but they also use the same HOA Bylaws that covers the overall development.**

13.5 **SPEAKING:** None.

13.6 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:**

13.7 **MOTION: 37C05 – CUP Permit. Commissioner Daniels 21:20:43 I would like to recommend final approval for conditional permit 27C05 based on findings contained in the Staff Report**

and the testimony heard tonight for a residential planned unit development with the listed six conditions.

SECOND: 21:21:13 Commissioner Calacino. I would like to clarify on the retaining wall that we discussed that the applicant is agreeable to it being rock and the other abutting developer is willing to share the wall along the property line.

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Barbour – Do we have a copy of the Home Owner’s Association of the CC&R’s. Mr. Maloy - We have received a copy from Signature Development, however, have not received one from Prolifica. It is Staff’s desire that the CC&R’s are the same for both developments. Commissioner Overson - Would those not be required for the subdivision?

Mr. Maloy - With the subdivision there is a requirement for adequate maintenance and protection of the open space. Where common space is involved, Staff wants to make sure there is a legal document in place for guidance and to safeguard the City’s interest.

Commissioner Overson - Then that would be included with the subdivision and not with the conditional use permit. Commissioner Daniels - I would like to amend my motion include the CC&R’s are joint and the retaining wall will be constructed of rock. Commissioner Overson – To clarify, your reference to the joint CC&R’s would be included as part of the residential subdivision. Commissioner Daniels - Yes.

Commissioner Overson restated the motion: We have a motion by Commissioner Daniels and second by Commissioner Calacino based on what we have included in our Staff Report and oral testimony discussed this evening with the applicant for Conditional Use Permit #37C05.

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

- 13.8 **MOTION:** 4S06 - Residential Subdivision. 21:24:31 Commissioner Calacino – I will make a motion that we grant final approval of Subdivision Application 4S06 for Prolifica for development of property at Winchester at 6657 South based on the findings of fact, analysis in staff report, discussion this evening, and including Staff Recommendations 1-6, emphasizing that the Commission needs the CC&R’s for this development and the Signature development to be joint.

SECOND: Commissioner Daniels

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Barbour - Would the CC&R’s then cover the HOA as a joint? I think we are talking about two different things here. Commissioner Calacino - There are HOA Bylaws and then CC&R’s that the HOA enforces for the development, which should go in tandem obviously. The Commission is recommending that both developments use the same HOA Bylaws and the same CC&R’s to govern maintenance of the property. That is being stipulated as a condition of approval for the development. Commissioner Barbour - Then can we have something put in there regarding a joint HOA? Commissioner Calacino - Yes. I will amend my motion to add as part of Condition #5 that not only the CC&R’s to be jointly used by both developments but they also use the same HOA Bylaws that covers the overall development. It will be treated as one development, even though it is two different developers and two separate property owners.

Commissioner Overson restated the motion. We have a motion by Commissioner Calacino to approve File 4S06 with Staff Recommendations 1-6, adding #7 that the same HOA Bylaws be used for both developments (Prolifica and Signature) and clarifying that Condition #5 refers to both sets of CC&R’s.

VOTE: All Commissioners present voted in favor. Motion passes unanimously.

SUBDIVISION

- | |
|---|
| 14. 10S06 Michael Dutson – 6392 S. 2200 W. - Preliminary review of a two-lot residential subdivision. (Michael Maloy/City Planner) |
|---|

14.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. (Heard along with Item #12). **Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:**

1. City Staff shall administrate final subdivision application review.
2. Application must receive approval from all applicable reviewing agencies of the City (i.e., City Engineer, Salt Lake County Fire Department, Taylorsville-Bennion Improvement District, etc) prior to recordation.

3. Applicant must include a statement on recording document(s) that private roads are not maintained by the City of Taylorsville.
4. Applicant shall contact Salt Lake County Recorder's Office and verify record-ability of all required legal documents including proposed subdivision name prior to final submission of a subdivision documents to be recorded.
5. Applicant shall pay all required fees prior to final approval of the subdivision plat including Storm Water Impact Fee and Recordation Fee.
6. Applicant shall design the private driveway and locate all utilities in a manner that is compliant with Taylorsville City Code and with the City Engineer's memorandum of June 7, 2006.
7. Other conditions as deemed appropriate by the Planning Commission.

14.2 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Mr. Dutson** was present.

14.4 **SPEAKING:** None.

14.5 **CLOSED FOR PLANNING COMMISSION OR A MOTION:**

14.5 **MOTION:** Motion was made with Agenda #13, see above.

15. 4S06 **Ronald Daw (Prolifica LLC)** – 1280 W. Winchester Street and 6657 S. 1300 W. - Final approval of a subdivision plat for a 20 unit single-family attached residential PUD. (Michael Maloy/City Planner)

15.1 **Mr. Maloy** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. Prolifica has requested final approval of a subdivision plat for 20 attached single-family residential units on approximately 1.86 acres of property located approximately at the northeast intersection of 1300 West and Winchester. (This item was heard with Agenda Item #13). **Staff recommends approval with the following conditions:**

1. Prior to plat recordation, applicant shall correct subdivision plat and civil engineering plans as required by the City Engineer.
2. Prior to plat recordation, applicant shall provide documentation acceptable to the City Engineer regarding the access easement on 1300 West.
3. Prior to plat recordation, applicant shall provide a copy of the Salt Lake County Storm Water Discharge Permit.
4. Prior to plat recordation, applicant shall provide civil engineering plans for electrical services within project including street lights, common space amenities and landscaping infrastructure.
5. **[Changed by Motion]** Prior to plat recordation, applicant shall submit for City review and approval a copy of proposed codes, covenants and restrictions (CC&R's) to ensure proper maintenance of common space. **That not only are the CC&R's to be jointly used by both developments but they also use the same HOA Bylaws that cover the overall development.**
6. Prior to plat recordation applicant shall obtain final approval of corresponding conditional use permit #37C05.

15.2 **MOTION:** Motion made with Agenda Item #13. See Above.

16. 14S05 **Brent Overson, 5161 S. 1130 W.** - 9-Lot Subdivision (Final, Regular Subdivision Amendment). (Dan Udall/City Planner)

Commissioner Overson excused herself from hearing this item due to conflict of interest in that her husband is the applicant and turned the chair duties to Commissioner Jensen.

21:28:13

16.1 **Mr. Udall** oriented on the site plan, aerial map and images. **21:28:43 Mr. Udall** reviewed the original recommendations, which were subsequently appealed by the applicant and was granted approval of the appeal by the City Council. The applicant is now proposing a private road with a cul-de-sac and a **21:29:41** 20' wide stub to the lot to the north. The applicant is proposing a vinyl fence wall along 1130 West, which must accommodate the clear view area. The Jordan River meandering path extends into the six lots on the east side of the subdivision and a note will need to be placed on the plat indicating that these lots are in the corridor. **Staff is recommending final subdivision approval subject to the following conditions:**

1. Receive approval from and remain compliant with all applicable reviewing agencies.
2. That the subdivision is recorded by plat and that the plat complies with City Ordinance 12.16.010.
3. That the project receives storm drain approval from the City Engineering Department and pays the appropriate fees.
4. That any subdivision amendments proposed after the initial recordation are reviewed and approved by the Planning Commission. The amendment must then be recorded.
5. That street lights should be installed as determined by the City Engineer.
6. **[Deleted by Motion]** ~~That a note be provided on the subdivision plat stating that a no build easement be decided to the lots adjacent to the Jordan River Corridor. Staff will need to approve where this easement will be located.~~
7. That a note be provided on the subdivision plat stating that no buildings will be built in a 100' no build easement adjacent to the Jordan River.
8. **[Changed by Motion]** That a 6' high wrought iron fence be provided on all lots that are adjacent to or within 100' of the Jordan River. The fence shall be placed at least 50' from the Jordan River corridor and be designed in such a way as to ~~minimize~~ **maximize** the visual impact from the Jordan River Parkway. The fence shall be installed prior to any building permits being issued for the subdivision.
9. That on the eastern side of the lots adjacent to the Jordan River, a landscaping plan will be required. The landscape plan shall identify a landscape strategy that sufficiently buffers the Jordan River and Jordan River Parkway utilizing appropriate plant materials for the Jordan River Parkway. All landscaping plans for areas within 100' of the Jordan River must be approved by City Staff.
10. That the final subdivision plat is subject to approval of final engineering drawings or permits.
11. **[Changed by Motion]** ~~That a note on the plat is provided stating that Lots 2 through 7 are located in the Jordan River Meandering Corridor.~~ That if a note is required to be on the plat regarding the Jordan River Meandering Corridor, that it be determined and put in writing by either the City Engineer or Salt Lake County Flood Control Department. If it is determined that it be so, then it shall be on the plat. Finally, it is understood that in the alignment of the stub street to the north that it can be done prior to recording of the plat and does not need to come back to this Body.
12. That the wall along 1130 West meets the clear view ordinance.

16.2 **DISCUSSION:** **Commissioner Barbour** wanted to know if Mr. Overson had received a copy of the Staff Report and if he was in agreement with the conditions. **Commissioner Jensen** indicated that all properties on the north and south of this site have a trail in place. He wondered if this property would be included.

16.3 **APPLICANT ADDRESS:** **Brent Overson**. **21:36:29** **Mr. Overson** indicated he had received a copy of the Staff Report. He advised Commissioner Jensen that he had met with the Mayor and Staff two weeks ago and was informed they were going to grant an easement for drainage in exchange for access to a future train system, which he was amenable to doing. **21:37:19** He continued on to say that the natural habitat will be maintained as far as is possible and he would install a 6' high wrought iron fence along the eastern boundary with the Jordan River only. **Commissioner Daniels** asked if the wrought iron fence would be gated and **Mr. Overson** said it would, with a gate to each lot. **Mr. Overson** asked that the wording on Condition #8 be changed from "to minimize the visual impact" to "to maximize the visual impact". He also asked that Condition #6 be eliminated because it is provided for in #7 and was a part of the approved appeal verdict. On #11, he felt the City doesn't have the authority to change a County ordinance with respect to the meander line. The way the meander corridor ordinance reads is that once it receives approval from Salt Lake County Flood Control, in accordance with the meander corridor ordinance, the line disappears and the meander corridor line is amended to circumvent the property in that fashion. **Mr. Udall** interjected that lines stay there forever and **Mr. Overson** disagreed. **Commissioner Calacino** advised that would be a decision made by Salt Lake County and not this body. **Mr. Overson** advised that the City Engineer has indicated that the line would disappear and the County has indicated the same. He continued on to say that in the Analysis portion of the Staff Report, Staff indicated that the Planning Commission may desire a pedestrian easement walkway be provided along the south or north side of a lot adjacent to the Jordan River so pedestrians can have access to any future walkway along the Jordan River. He felt that would be inappropriate to have a public easement through any of the lots where this is a private lane. He also referred to what is being called a plat amendment, however, the area in question is actually a driveway access. That particular lot has a deed restriction which would not allow any other access beyond that lot. **Mr. Overson** commented that the Planning Director has indicated that the driveway could be moved as much as 5' without coming in for a plat amendment and asked for some flexibility in being able to move that road 5' to 10'.

16.3 **SPEAKING:** None.

16.4

MOTION: Commissioner Calacino – 21:46:45 With regard to this application, several things could be simplified, so if there is no further discussion, I will make a motion. Based on the previous discussions of this application, findings of fact and decisions made by the City Council regarding this proposed development, so forth, I would recommend that we grant approval of this application for a nine lot development on 1130 West, Application #14S05, including Staff Recommendations 1-12, with the following clarifications: #6, be struck as being redundant as #7 covers it, which basically says that there will be a 100' no build easement placed on the plat that affects the three most eastern lots, which will be indicated on the plat and it should read fairly clear where the no build easement will be located. Also, on #11, that if a note is required to be on the plat regarding the Jordan River Meandering Corridor, that it be determined and put in writing by either the City Engineer or Salt Lake County Flood Control Department. If it is determined that it be so, then it shall be on the plat. Finally, it is understood that in the alignment of the stub street to the north that it can be done prior to recording of the plat and does not need to come back to this Body as an amendment because it is not adding any lots. 21:47:28 .

SECOND: Commissioner Daniels

DISCUSSION: Commissioner Jensen - On #8 do we need to go through that and make it wrought iron fence along the east property and “maximize” the visual impact of the Jordan River rather than “minimize”. Commissioner Calacino and Commissioner Daniels both accepted that addition to the motion. Commissioner Jensen - I have one question for Commissioner Calacino and that is it is still allowed for a trail to go through the 50'. Commissioner Calacino - Based on the discussion, it sounds like that if the City purchases the property from Murray, to the east of this property and somehow an agreement will be made to use that property for the storm drainage detention basin for the subdivision, then the sub divider has basically granted right of way along that portion of the property to possibly accommodate a trail in the future. Commissioner Jensen - Then we have not locked that out? Commissioner Calacino - I don't believe we have, because there is a 100' no build zone in there to accommodate the buffer zone along the river. In the future, the City will probably be able to get some right of way through there. If we are not in agreement with that, I would recommend that we actually have a note added to the plat that there be a trail easement. That the 100' no build area along the river be used as a trail easement. However, I don't know why there would be a hardship with that. Mr. Udall – The trail would be along the 50' easement. Commissioner Calacino - Okay, then back up and I would add the condition that a note be put on the plat that if so found in the future, that the 50' no build zone along the river be accommodated for a trail in the future. That is a possibility based on the issues with the acquisition of the property and it is a done deal, so there should be no hesitation. Commissioner Jensen - Commissioner Daniels are you okay with that. Commissioner Daniels - Yes. 21:50:43

VOTE:	<u>Commissioner Jensen</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Bolton</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Smith</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Barbour</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Daniels</u>	AYE	<u>Commissioner Rushton-Carlson</u>	AYE
	<u>Commissioner Calacino</u>	NAY		
	Motion passes 6 – 1. <u>21:51:36</u>			

MEETING REVIEW: Commissioner Jensen gave the report on events occurring during the last City Council meeting. 21:51:45

ADJOURNMENT: By motion of Commissioner Calacino, the meeting was adjourned at 10:05 p.m. 22:03:05

Respectfully submitted by:

Jean Gallegos, Admin Assistant to the
Planning Commission

Approved in meeting held on August 10, 2006 (Wednesday).